4/11/71

Dear Miss Goddard,

It is good to hear from you after so long a time. The developments you term interesting are, indeed. With a publisher who had the knowhow and the backing, my current book could not be more topical (reviews enclosed- I can supply if your bookstore doesn't have it).

If I knew you were writing a book, I'd forgotten, but I'm glad. There can't be too many-if they are responsible. We get the closest scrutiny ever. An example, a sycophant in the NY Post, who could find no error in my work and chose to ignore most of it, criticized a typo and, while pretending to deprecate the work and discourage sales, in essence agreed with what it says. But the depressing effect on sales is there, and this is what publishers worry about.

I can tell you where you can get a picture of that sidewalk slash. If you do, I hope you will be able to provide me with a print. I seem to recall having seen one, as you, but I was responsible for the taking of special pictures of it and the negatives are in NYC. In 11/68 I went to Dallas with John Pilger, of the largest paper in London, I think the Express, and Matt Herron, then of New Orleans, who was with Black Star. I helped them with a story John wrote. Matt was supposed to get a set of contacts of all the pictures he took for me, but he didn't. He later said it is because he mailed the undeveloped negatives to Black Star. So, they should be able to find them. Strangely, while we were there, an unknown man came up to me, recognizing me from TV appearances, asked to be photographed with me, and Matt did it. Som because he bought a print (Matt has no other need of that picture, perhaps this also can lead Black Star to it. But the assignment for the paper, Dallas and the date, 11/68, midmonth, should be enough. I did several broadcasts then, and Aldredge phoned me on one to add to what the FBI reported, that a conscious effort seemed to have been made to make that slash less obvious, adding something like asbestos to it.

You mention some names in your letter. I do not take the liberty of unsolicited advice save with one, Roger Craig. He is so sincere, could not be more so-or more wrong about some of his story. His account of the alteration of his testimony is fiction. I have checked it out. I fear that like so many, he has confabulated and, at worst, may be mentally ill. His trials are great and real, and some of his story is, without doubt, but that bit about Bradley falls of its own weight. And can Bradley be the tramp for Sprague and Harrison and simultaneously a neatly-dressed Secret Service man for Roger? I know that the whole Bradley things are advanced by Garrison was contrived, by whom, by whom it was magnified and given the semblance of reality for Garrisen, and that even he then disowned it, faced with the proof. Some of us are too anxious, too critical, too little informed of the probative evidence, and with the greatest sincerity, the best of motive, do and have done enormous harm and have helped destroy everyones credibility. So, I hope you will be extremely careful and submit your work to the closest scrutiny of those who really do know the fact. None meeting this description are named in your letter, alas. I wish I could volunteer, but it is impossible. I am too far behind in my own work, and there is too much of that stacked up, started, almost ready, and planned but, I think, also important. And, unless I can turn out a work that can yield some return, we will live in perpetual bankruptcy, a condition already aggravated by the need for undoing the harm by the well-,eaning wrong among us. Best of good luck, and thanks for writing.

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg